

**The Sun**  
WILLIAM M. LAFAN.  
SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1902.  
Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.  
DAILY, Per Month \$3.00  
DAILY, Per Year \$30.00  
SUNDAY, Per Year \$10.00  
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year \$35.00  
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month \$3.50  
Postage to foreign countries added.  
THE SUN, New York City.  
PUBLISHED BY THE SUN PUBLISHING CO., 125 N. 5TH ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA.  
If your friends who favor us wish to contribute to our publication, we will be glad to receive their contributions, and we will be glad to receive their contributions, and we will be glad to receive their contributions.

**Who Is the Striker?**  
It will be time to regard the canal negotiations with Colombia as off when the President reports to Congress that such is the case. An event so vitally important to the future of the greatest enterprise which the nation now has in hand is not likely to be ignored in the annual message due next week.

Meanwhile, the reports as to the exact nature of the hitch in the proceedings are entirely unofficial. They differ considerably. They cannot all be true, for it is not possible at the same time that Señor VINCENTE CONCHA, the Colombian Minister, is representing correctly the attitude of his home Government in the business and that he is mutinously refusing to obey orders from Bogotá and sign the treaty.

Between these two extreme theories of the source of trouble there is room for various suppositions. It is idle to discuss them, inasmuch as a reference of the matter directly to the Colombian Government at Bogotá, over Señor CONCHA's head and through the American Minister at Bogotá, is likely to elude the desired information. The report that the Department of State has already taken this course is quite credible.

In considering the possibility of attempted hold-ups of the canal enterprise, either by mercenary individuals temporarily in relation to the negotiations, or as the deliberate policy of a mercenary Government which thinks itself in a position to extort its own terms, there is one thing that ought not to be forgotten.

The Nicaraguans are now contrasting the alleged disposition shown by the Government of Colombia to make use of its opportunities for extortion with the alleged good faith and reasonableness of Nicaragua and Costa Rica and their readiness to let our canal go through by that route on our own terms.

Leaving Nicaragua out of the question, what is the position of Costa Rica, whose consent and cooperation are just as requisite as those of her neighbor, if Panama is to be abandoned and the inferior route adopted?

What is the status of negotiations with Costa Rica? At the time of the passage of the Spooner bill it was thus described in the report of May 31, 1902, signed by Senator HILLARD, Senator PRITCHARD, Senator MILLARD and Senator KITTREDGE of the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals:

"If the Nicaragua-Costa Rica route were adopted, it now appears beyond question that satisfactory rights can never be obtained from Costa Rica until the Constitution of that Government has been amended. How many years would be needed to obtain such amendment, or whether it could ever be obtained, no one can say. As matters now stand, the immediate construction of the Nicaragua-Costa Rica Canal is impossible."

This opinion was not based upon vague generalities or prejudiced apprehensions, but upon this specific declaration by the President of Costa Rica, Señor RAFAEL IZQUIERDA, in his message to the Congress of that republic. It will be found in House Document No. 611, Fifty-second Congress, First Session, ordered printed on May 19, 1902.

In view of the great and paramount importance of this matter the canal project I deemed it expedient to call an advisory board consisting of persons of well known ability and patriotism in order to enlighten me in so delicate and grave a question. A committee under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State for the Department of Foreign Relations was appointed among the members of that board. This committee has discharged its duties in a satisfactory manner, touching all the points which in its opinion do not contravene the spirit of our political institutions, in conformity to the provisions of the fundamental code as regards the integrity of the territory and the exercise of sovereignty.

In consequence thereof, the Government is powerless to enter into positive negotiations with that of the United States of America unless there should be previously passed a Constitutional amendment by which such concessions for the construction of the inter-oceanic canal may be authorized, or the matter referred to public opinion in some other way by calling a constituent assembly for the purpose."

Such was the attitude of Costa Rica at the time when it seemed likely that the canal was going her way.

In Latin-American human nature so different from that of the United States, as to warrant the assumption that the potential strikers and hold-uppers of the United States Government all live in the neighborhood of the more southerly and superior canal route?

**Mrs. Heath and Miss Lynch.**

An extraordinary case of criminal libel was tried last week in the Westchester County Court at White Plains.

Mrs. ELIZA HEATH, editor of the *Mamaroneck Democrat*, had been indicted for criminal libel upon Miss ANNIE LYNCH, schoolteacher. Mrs. HEATH, as president of an alleged Vigilance Committee on Educational Management, had sent the subjoined letter to Miss LYNCH and to the President of the Board of Education of Mamaroneck:

"MAMARONECK: Statements being made relative to your misconduct upon your part, first with a youth after whose death certain obscene letters were found signed by you and your sister, second, relative to your acts of misconduct with Dr. HOGAN, health officer of this place, we, the Objecting Taxpayers, demand your resignation from the list of our teachers.

"We take this course because of your sex and because we do not desire by court proceedings to cause the report of your license, to the end that you may by God's grace have a chance to repent and reform."

While there was not the slightest evidence of any sort against the virtue of the young woman accused, the defence

sought to injure her on the trial and virtually to justify the libel. On cross-examination Mrs. HEATH, who copied the libellous letter for the accused, asked the witness who had seen Miss LYNCH in a buggy sitting on the lap of a physician. Mr. HEATH also testified that he had seen Miss LYNCH sitting on the doctor's lap, but only when there were three persons in the buggy.

Mrs. HEATH averred that her only recourse was to complain to the board about Miss LYNCH, of whom she had heard certain defamatory reports. Mrs. HEATH, however, was obliged to admit that she did not know of any single "unvirtuous" act ever committed by Miss LYNCH.

The physician in question testified that he was the family physician of the LYNCHES; that when the Lynch girls came to his house, they were always driven back either by himself or his wife, and the middle woman in the buggy, whether his wife or one of the Lynch girls, sat on no more on his knee than on the knee of the other woman.

Miss LYNCH swore that she never sat on the doctor's lap, and that when there were three in the buggy, she sometimes sat in the middle, but usually sat on the side of the seat.

In the face of all this testimony, and of the wanton and wicked nature of the libel which attacked a woman's virtue without the slightest apology or excuse, the jury acquitted the prisoner.

The rule in criminal libel is different from that in a civil action for libel. While justification or the truth of the published matter is a complete defence to a civil action, in criminal libel the matter charged as libellous is true, and was published "with good motives and for justifiable ends." So where the libel is true, that alone is not a sufficient defence if the defendant has published the matter wantonly and maliciously, without good motives or for vindictive ends.

It is manifest from the very statement of this case that Mrs. HEATH could have had no good motives in attacking a girl of unblemished character, and that her attack was made for no justifiable ends.

It is unfortunate that this Westchester jury did not show, by their verdict, a higher view of the importance of vindicating an innocent young woman.

The question might well be asked: "How would any one of these jurors feel if any member of his family were the victim of such an unprovoked and wicked attack as that contained in the letter of Mrs. HEATH's?"

**Church Attendance Here and in England.**

A census of church attendance was taken in Liverpool on the second Sunday in November on a plan similar to that simultaneously pursued in New York, to which we have already referred.

The number of persons found in the churches, combining both morning and evening services, was reported to be 177,435, except so far as concerns Roman Catholics, whose attendance at only one service was enumerated. The attendants were distributed among the different religious denominations, thus:

Church of England 67,998  
Roman Catholic (one service) 30,330  
Wesleyan 23,774  
Presbyterian 10,914  
Calvinist 8,927  
Congregationalist 8,960  
Baptist 1,266  
Unitarian 1,266  
Other denominations 8,237

It will be seen, therefore, that of those attending public worship in Liverpool, only about 38 per cent, or less than two, in five, belonged to the Church of England. Moreover, as a correspondent of the *London Daily News* points out, the attendance on the Roman Catholic churches must have been actually very numerous, since only those at only a single service were counted. It will be seen from a letter from a Roman Catholic, printed in an adjoining column of THE SUN to-day, that the accuracy of the similar census of the Catholic attendance in New York is called in question, as, apparently, it may be reasonably, on the ground that in those churches crowded services were held at early and at different hours on every Sunday and also on other days.

For example, in a Roman Catholic church in the neighborhood of Printing House Square an early mass, at 2:30 o'clock in the morning, is celebrated on Sundays, for the benefit of newspaper employees, more especially, and it is always largely attended, a very numerous delegation going from THE SUN office. A computation of the Catholic attendance on public worship is far more difficult to make than to count the congregations at the two stated Protestant services on Sunday.

The Liverpool census gives the church attendance as 177,435, out of a total population of the town in 1901 of 684,947, or something more than one-quarter. That percentage is less than it is in New York if only the adult population is considered.

Gross inaccuracies in the New York census are pointed out by Mr. WALTER LAIDLAW, the Secretary of the "Federation of Churches," but as like errors may be assumed in that of Liverpool, they may be treated as setting off each other.

Liverpool, moreover, is distinguished as one of the most religious communities of England, with Nonconformity greatly in the ascendancy, as the above table of church attendance so strikingly demonstrates.

It seems that a similar census is to be taken in London, but, as at Liverpool and at New York, it will be too inaccurate to be used as the basis for any other generalization than that a great majority of the population does not attend church services on Sunday.

In treating of the religious conditions and habits of New York, however, the half-million Jews on Manhattan Island, not included in the census taken on the first three Sundays of this month, must be considered. Add the great aggregate attendance on the synagogues and supply the obviously large omissions in the Catholic Church attendance, and also some in that of Protestants, and New York, probably, would appear as the great city of the world in which this form of religious observance is largest proportionately.

The correspondent of the *London*

paper to whom we have referred speaks of the Liverpool census as indicative of a "discouraging state of things" in England generally, so far as concerns religious observance, if not faith. Great as is the number of those who stay away from the churches in Liverpool, it is not as great as it is in other towns of the kingdom, and among country people there seems to be more religious indifference than in the towns. He tells of going, on a fine Sunday morning, to the church of a quiet village, surrounded by a pastoral population, and counting only seventeen adults present at the service, every one from houses close by—"from the outside farms and cottages not a solitary one." Religious indifference in our country communities is often deplored, but we question if it ever goes to so great an extreme as that. The institution of the old-fashioned prayer-meeting, once regarded as the surest test of the spiritual vitality of an "evangelical" church, seems to have fallen largely into disuse in American country life, and general neglect of the family prayer, once universal in pious American households, is reported from New England, more specifically. Pleasures and recreations formerly reprobated as ungodly or at least unbecoming are now frequent, if not usual. Neglect to attend public worship on Sunday, which once singled out the offender for reproach, is no longer counted against him by public sentiment. But, as we have intimated, attendance on a country church in a well-populated pastoral region is not as paltry here as it was found to be in the English village described.

Undoubtedly, both in this country and England indifference to religious services has increased relatively during the last generation. Great numbers of people, and men, more especially, never think of entering a church unless to attend a wedding or a funeral. A very considerable part of immigrants lose church-going habits which they brought here, though the Roman Catholic Church works indefatigably to retain its hold on its children from other lands, and at present from Italy, more particularly. In computing the percentage of continuing religious faith and practice among the more recent immigrants, however, the great Jewish immigration must be borne in mind. These Jews are usually of the strictly Orthodox order and therefore are even fervently devoted to their ancient faith and ritual, as was demonstrated so violently on the occasion of the funeral of Rabbi JOSEPH.

Of the reported attendance at the Liverpool churches not Roman Catholic, the order numerically was, first, Church of England; second, Wesleyan or Methodist; third, Baptist; fourth, Presbyterian. In New York the census as taken put the Episcopal first, the Presbyterian second, including the cognate Reformed, the Baptist third, and the Methodist fourth. Here, as in Liverpool, the majority of Protestants are what are called Nonconformists in England; but with us the Roman Catholic preponderance is far greater.

**Organized Play.**

Blessings on the man—or was it some dog or demigod or wise woman?—that invented child-study, child-psychology and other boons! The facilities, all the modern conveniences, so to speak, now at the service of the lucky children of to-day, are marvellous, all but incredible. For example, look at grand, old Indianapolis, the Hoosier Paris. In the Indianapolis schools "the play of the children at recess time has been 'organized.'" So many minutes for gymnastics, so many for ping-pong, so many for tag and hoop, and so on. Every child plays on schedule time, has to live and play according to a timetable. Three minutes with the bean bags, 2½ at the skipping rope. Organized labor, organized play!

We are working, we are playing in a grand and wondrous time. It is one of the many regrets of all of us who are growing old that we cannot live to see the triumphs of civilization our prophetic souls foresee. Children have been brought up according to wrong methods. In the dark forward and abyss of time shines a great light. Our dim eyes behold Automatic Children. They are wound up like a clock. They are their own time punch and strike the hours, quarters and halves. They play eighteen different games in fifteen minutes, adjusting their own machinery. Do you want 'em to sing? Press the accordion arrangement, and vox humana attachment in their minds, if you please. Do you want to hear 'em name the Presidents, the Roman Emperors, the principal rivers, mountain ranges, connect the wires. These are the finest mechanical toys ever exhibited. Their work runs down at 8:17 P. M. Then the little ones undress, fall into bed and cover themselves automatically. Mother can go off to the club. If there is any noise in the nursery, punish the offender next day by refusing to wind him up. Still, if he is big enough to be a stem-winder, what can you do?

We, who foretold the Automatic Servant, now foretell the Automatic Child. Will he have as much fun as his predecessors? Why not? Self-love will teach him to appreciate his mechanical make-up and his play will be much more efficiently "organized" than is now possible, even in Indianapolis.

The Hon. BOB TAYLOR of Tennessee is illustrious for the magic of his career of catgut and for the molasses of his rhetoric. It seems that he is also a great naturalist, a master of those that know. A paper in *Minneapolis* describes lovingly a lecture of his in that town. We see the old, familiar "word-picture of rural Tennessee, with its mountains and sunlight, its green fields and brooks, its birds and trees" and hear again the "necromancy of the old plantation fiddle and bow," but here is something new:

"The function of every beast, bird, flower and insect is known to him."  
Ought not the Hon. BOB TAYLOR to hang out the fiddle and the bow and become a school of zoology and botany?

The Hon. BOOTH TARKINGTON was baffled in his efforts to break into the Indiana Legislature. There was a great deal of "repeating" in his district. Men came from the uttermost parts of Posey county and voted against Mr. TARKINGTON, not because they loved him less, but because they loved livestock more and were eager to prevent him from discarding it for politics. That there may be no misunderstanding of Indiana's feeling in the matter, an office of a "non-partisan" and ornamental kind has just been given to another Wabash divinity, the Hon. CHARLES MAJOR, described in an Indianapolis dispatch to the *Cincinnati Enquirer* as "the author of *Shoeville*." We do not know the question, but there is no doubt that Mr. MAJOR has been appointed a Trustee of Purdue University. Easy work and no pay. Indiana is wise enough not to interfere for a moment the glad play of genius upon the typewriter.

Has the Hon. WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON of Massachusetts and Manila heard the terrible news from New York, N. Y., Del. Thanksgiving Day ninety prisoners at the workhouse of that city were allowed to go out and play football. Now, football is the source of war and all other crime, as Mr. GARRISON has proved frequently. Are prisoners to be reformed or to be shoved still further down the steep grade of crime, *descensus Averni*? Mr. GARRISON is not the man to solve this question with a quibble nor to content himself with saying that football is a game worthy of criminals. If football is a crime, the officials of the New Castle workhouse are accessories to crime. There ought to be a meeting in Faneuil Hall to protest against this outrage. The breath is gone from anti-imperialism; will not anti-footballism take the place of that lost LENORE of Mr. GARRISON'S?

**CANAL TREATY UNNECESSARY.**

Senator Cullom Thinks We Can Build Panama Canal After Paying for Title.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 28.—Senator Cullom, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, inclines to the belief that it is unnecessary for the United States to make treaty with Colombia in order to acquire the right to build a canal across the Isthmus of Panama. Mr. Cullom will not make a positive statement to this effect, but it is known that he may take this position positively and publicly in the near future.

Senator Cullom called on the President this morning to talk about the Isthmian canal. He said that he would employ the very best engineers to build the canal, and that he would not be taken down to appoint the permanent canal commission, and the President told him that the consideration of this subject at present would, in his opinion, be premature. He wishes to consider the Colombian situation a little further before deciding upon a line of action looking to the appointment of the commission and the actual construction of the waterway.

But a second reading of the despatch reveals its inconsistency, and vividly suggests that legal writers are so fond of phrasing as "a menace more apparent than real." Whether inspired by Colombian diplomacy in Washington or by Bogota statecraft it is as specious a piece of "news" as was ever launched, for the flimsy character of the fabric is only too obvious.

Who will build at Panama if the United States does not? Will any foreign Government do so? No. The preservation of the *catene* with our Government will deter any European Power from embarking in canal enterprises on American soil, for all European statesmen by now are familiar with the spirit, as well as the letter, of the Monroe Doctrine. Will any South American or Central American Government recognize its exemption from the ban of the Doctrine, venture upon canal construction?

Certainly not. No New World Government but ourselves has a commerce to foster and extend, and none has the necessary money for canal building. Colombia can hardly do so with her credit so completely in extremis that her dollar (the peso) has an exchange value of less than two cents.

Will any corporation, made up of capitalists of Europe, the United States, or South America, take the place of the French company at Panama?

Emphatically no; and for this reason: Moved men the world over perceive that the United States is bound to create a canal connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific, even if forced to employ the very people demanding a Governmental canal, and any astute capitalist knows that the turning of the first spadeful of earth in Nicaragua by our Government would render a canal at Panama, owned by individuals, not worth a dollar.

Are we going into the canal business to develop commerce under the Stars and Stripes, and to tap new sources of wealth in many sections, especially on the west coast of South America and in the Orient. The levying of tolls, after the manner of the Suez company, is not to be the consideration. Assuredly a canal owned by individuals cannot hope to compete with a public waterway owned by a powerful Government, whatever their relative physical merits, for tolls on the Governmental canal might be made so high that competition would be strangled. And, besides, our Government would probably not be long in the business before its canal would be thrown open to nominally free navigation, the expense of operation being defrayed from the public purse as rivers, harbors and other public works are maintained. If toll roads and bridges are already rare, a few months since, in the *North American Review*, I mentioned the likelihood of our last of our political parties, attempting popular support, incorporating a free-canal plank in its platform before our canal is more than finished.

Colombia is too backward to resort to such spineless bluff as that printed in last Tuesday's journals. Nearly three years of civil war has reduced her to a state of straits that she can scarcely extricate herself from.

A traveler may pass weeks there without seeing a coin of gold, silver or copper; and her white paper money has no tangible value. The day has come when the traveler comes to a Government as to an individual, and cannot refuse to raise more money by bond issues or by peddling taxes and customs receipts.

Logical and earnest discussion never will win public opinion, and national policies must have their origin in individual minds. I modestly suggest, therefore, that our Government take into consideration the fact that circumstances have placed us in control of the Isthmian canal situation in all its bearings. We have not conspired to this end—it is the outcome of "destiny," possibly it is the fact.

Allow Colombia to ride her high horse as long as she pleases. It will not be long before she comes knocking at our door, and the Department of State to inquire if our Government is willing to resume canal negotiations. A canal is not so imperative a need, about the necessities of our people. For generations our people have debated the subject, and a delay now of another year, or two years, for that matter, will do nothing to hamper the material welfare of our nation.

When overtures come from Colombia, as they surely will, it will then be time for the President, the Secretary of State, the Speaker of the House and the Senate to stipulate a broader character for any renewed negotiations, namely, to treat for the transfer to the American flag of the whole of the Isthmus of Panama, for an equitable cash consideration. We have been discussing the assignment by Colombia of what is called the right to sovereignty over a "strip" of Panama territory. Here I desire to express the patriotic sentiment that the United States has no need to deal at all with boundaries in this case.

The feeling by the Government of a six-mile "strip" could have but one outcome, perpetual and vexatious argument between the Colombian and the United States, and the right to execute laws of our making. Dwellers in the State of Panama have no attention for the Bogota Government, and we welcome the boundaries of our Government in Panama, and postage stamps used in every part of Colombia have been circulated on the Isthmian memorandum. The Washington authorities to enforce the region, and for a long time it has been the custom of Isthmian families to disown the name of Colombians, asserting a preference to be called "Panamanians."

The fact that our Government is compelled by treaty to maintain order on the Isthmus, and within the year has frequently continued for the purpose of a declaration of a movement looking to the ownership of Panama by the United States.

Would not every nation having a regard for peaceful stability endorse a movement which would bring to the Isthmus—destination to be mutually determined by the United States and Colombia—an administration that would secure property and life and equal rights to every dweller there, and every user of the railroad, and of a canal?

Under our control, marauding at Panama, whether it were a Territory like Hawaii or a colony like Porto Rico, would be as unpalatable as in Philadelphia.

Public sentiment is favorable to expansion, and the extension of United States territory by judicious purchase has ever been fortunate. In support of this I would advise a perusal of the literature of the St. Louis Exposition commemorative of the Louisiana Purchase, and to make inquiry as to the present value of Alaska. We should not seek to take advantage of Colombia's necessities, but pay her a reasonable price—whatever the amount, it would bring us something a hundredfold more valuable than the proprietorship of the Philippines in my judgment.

Incidentally, it would be only right for us to do what we can to protect the French people in their rights under existing Colombian concessions and agreements, should the report that the Colombians intend unjust treatment to them have any foundation. France has a right to be satisfied with the country, and her citizens in the Panama Canal Company made us a most liberal

## THE COLOMBIAN "DEADLOCK."

Spirited Advice Concerning American Policy on the Isthmus.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—The news from Washington, printed in New York newspapers of Tuesday morning, that Colombia had abruptly broken off negotiations with the United States in the Panama Canal matter, and that a coup was hinted at by the Bogota authorities by which the French company's concession would be declared vacated in 1904, whereupon a new concession would be offered to practically the highest bidder, was sufficient to produce a feeling of consternation to any one taking an active interest in the Isthmian canal situation.

But a second reading of the despatch reveals its inconsistency, and vividly suggests that legal writers are so fond of phrasing as "a menace more apparent than real." Whether inspired by Colombian diplomacy in Washington or by Bogota statecraft it is as specious a piece of "news" as was ever launched, for the flimsy character of the fabric is only too obvious.

Who will build at Panama if the United States does not? Will any foreign Government do so? No. The preservation of the *catene* with our Government will deter any European Power from embarking in canal enterprises on American soil, for all European statesmen by now are familiar with the spirit, as well as the letter, of the Monroe Doctrine. Will any South American or Central American Government recognize its exemption from the ban of the Doctrine, venture upon canal construction?

Certainly not. No New World Government but ourselves has a commerce to foster and extend, and none has the necessary money for canal building. Colombia can hardly do so with her credit so completely in extremis that her dollar (the peso) has an exchange value of less than two cents.

Will any corporation, made up of capitalists of Europe, the United States, or South America, take the place of the French company at Panama?

Emphatically no; and for this reason: Moved men the world over perceive that the United States is bound to create a canal connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific, even if forced to employ the very people demanding a Governmental canal, and any astute capitalist knows that the turning of the first spadeful of earth in Nicaragua by our Government would render a canal at Panama, owned by individuals, not worth a dollar.

Are we going into the canal business to develop commerce under the Stars and Stripes, and to tap new sources of wealth in many sections, especially on the west coast of South America and in the Orient. The levying of tolls, after the manner of the Suez company, is not to be the consideration. Assuredly a canal owned by individuals cannot hope to compete with a public waterway owned by a powerful Government, whatever their relative physical merits, for tolls on the Governmental canal might be made so high that competition would be strangled. And, besides, our Government would probably not be long in the business before its canal would be thrown open to nominally free navigation, the expense of operation being defrayed from the public purse as rivers, harbors and other public works are maintained. If toll roads and bridges are already rare, a few months since, in the *North American Review*, I mentioned the likelihood of our last of our political parties, attempting popular support, incorporating a free-canal plank in its platform before our canal is more than finished.

Colombia is too backward to resort to such spineless bluff as that printed in last Tuesday's journals. Nearly three years of civil war has reduced her to a state of straits that she can scarcely extricate herself from.

A traveler may pass weeks there without seeing a coin of gold, silver or copper; and her white paper money has no tangible value. The day has come when the traveler comes to a Government as to an individual, and cannot refuse to raise more money by bond issues or by peddling taxes and customs receipts.

Logical and earnest discussion never will win public opinion, and national policies must have their origin in individual minds. I modestly suggest, therefore, that our Government take into consideration the fact that circumstances have placed us in control of the Isthmian canal situation in all its bearings. We have not conspired to this end—it is the outcome of "destiny," possibly it is the fact.

Allow Colombia to ride her high horse as long as she pleases. It will not be long before she comes knocking at our door, and the Department of State to inquire if our Government is willing to resume canal negotiations. A canal is not so imperative a need, about the necessities of our people. For generations our people have debated the subject, and a delay now of another year, or two years, for that matter, will do nothing to hamper the material welfare of our nation.

When overtures come from Colombia, as they surely will, it will then be time for the President, the Secretary of State, the Speaker of the House and the Senate to stipulate a broader character for any renewed negotiations, namely, to treat for the transfer to the American flag of the whole of the Isthmus of Panama, for an equitable cash consideration. We have been discussing the assignment by Colombia of what is called the right to sovereignty over a "strip" of Panama territory. Here I desire to express the patriotic sentiment that the United States has no need to deal at all with boundaries in this case.

The feeling by the Government of a six-mile "strip" could have but one outcome, perpetual and vexatious argument between the Colombian and the United States, and the right to execute laws of our making. Dwellers in the State of Panama have no attention for the Bogota Government, and we welcome the boundaries of our Government in Panama, and postage stamps used in every part of Colombia have been circulated on the Isthmian memorandum. The Washington authorities to enforce the region, and for a long time it has been the custom of Isthmian families to disown the name of Colombians, asserting a preference to be called "Panamanians."

The fact that our Government is compelled by treaty to maintain order on the Isthmus, and within the year has frequently continued for the purpose of a declaration of a movement looking to the ownership of Panama by the United States.

Would not every nation having a regard for peaceful stability endorse a movement which would bring to the Isthmus—destination to be mutually determined by the United States and Colombia—an administration that would secure property and life and equal rights to every dweller there, and every user of the railroad, and of a canal?

Under our control, marauding at Panama, whether it were a Territory like Hawaii or a colony like Porto Rico, would be as unpalatable as in Philadelphia.

Public sentiment is favorable to expansion, and the extension of United States territory by judicious purchase has ever been fortunate. In support of this I would advise a perusal of the literature of the St. Louis Exposition commemorative of the Louisiana Purchase, and to make inquiry as to the present value of Alaska. We should not seek to take advantage of Colombia's necessities, but pay her a reasonable price—whatever the amount, it would bring us something a hundredfold more valuable than the proprietorship of the Philippines in my judgment.

Incidentally, it would be only right for us to do what we can to protect the French people in their rights under existing Colombian concessions and agreements, should the report that the Colombians intend unjust treatment to them have any foundation. France has a right to be satisfied with the country, and her citizens in the Panama Canal Company made us a most liberal

## THE COLOMBIAN "DEADLOCK."

Spirited Advice Concerning American Policy on the Isthmus.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—The news from Washington, printed in New York newspapers of Tuesday morning, that Colombia had abruptly broken off negotiations with the United States in the Panama Canal matter, and that a coup was hinted at by the Bogota authorities by which the French company's concession would be declared vacated in 1904, whereupon a new concession would be offered to practically the highest bidder, was sufficient to produce a feeling of consternation to any one taking an active interest in the Isthmian canal situation.

But a second reading of the despatch reveals its inconsistency, and vividly suggests that legal writers are so fond of phrasing as "a menace more apparent than real." Whether inspired by Colombian diplomacy in Washington or by Bogota statecraft it is as specious a piece of "news" as was ever launched, for the flimsy character of the fabric is only too obvious.

Who will build at Panama if the United States does not? Will any foreign Government do so? No. The preservation of the *catene* with our Government will deter any European Power from embarking in canal enterprises on American soil, for all European statesmen by now are familiar with the spirit, as well as the letter, of the Monroe Doctrine. Will any South American or Central American Government recognize its exemption from the ban of the Doctrine, venture upon canal construction?

Certainly not. No New World Government but ourselves has a commerce to foster and extend, and none has the necessary money for canal building. Colombia can hardly do so with her credit so completely in extremis that her dollar (the peso) has an exchange value of less than two cents.

Will any corporation, made up of capitalists of Europe, the United States, or South America, take the place of the French company at Panama?

Emphatically no; and for this reason: Moved men the world over perceive that the United States is bound to create a canal connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific, even if forced to employ the very people demanding a Governmental canal, and any astute capitalist knows that the turning of the first spadeful of earth in Nicaragua by our Government would render a canal at Panama, owned by individuals, not worth a dollar.

Are we going into the canal business to develop commerce under the Stars and Stripes, and to tap new sources of wealth in many sections, especially on the west coast of South America and in the Orient. The levying of tolls, after the manner of the Suez company, is not to be the consideration. Assuredly a canal owned by individuals cannot hope to compete with a public waterway owned by a powerful Government, whatever their relative physical merits, for tolls on the Governmental canal might be made so high that competition would be strangled. And, besides, our Government would probably not be long in the business before its canal would be thrown open to nominally free navigation, the expense of operation being defrayed from the public purse as rivers, harbors and other public works are maintained. If toll roads and bridges are already rare, a few months since, in the *North American Review*, I mentioned the likelihood of our last of our political parties, attempting popular support, incorporating a free-canal plank in its platform before our canal is more than finished.

Colombia is too backward to resort to such spineless bluff as that printed in last Tuesday's journals. Nearly three years of civil war has reduced her to a state of straits that she can scarcely extricate herself from.

A traveler may pass weeks there without seeing a coin of gold, silver or copper; and her white paper money has no tangible value. The day has come when the traveler comes to a Government as to an individual, and cannot refuse to raise more money by bond issues or by peddling taxes and customs receipts.

Logical and earnest discussion never will win public opinion, and national policies must have their origin in individual minds. I modestly suggest, therefore, that our Government take into consideration the fact that circumstances have placed us in control of the Isthmian canal situation in all its bearings. We have not conspired to this end—it is the outcome of "destiny," possibly it is the fact.

Allow Colombia to ride her high horse as long as she pleases. It will not be long before she comes knocking at our door, and the Department of State to inquire if our Government is willing to resume canal negotiations. A canal is not so imperative a need, about the necessities of our people. For generations our people have debated the subject, and a delay now of another year, or two years, for that matter, will do nothing to hamper the material welfare of our nation.